UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
25th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 4 November 1992
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. ELARABY	(Egypt)
later:	Mr. PATOKALLIO (Vice-Chairman)	(Finland)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-61750 2588V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.25
4 December 1992

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 65, 68 AND 142; 67 AND 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Netherlands, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): On 9 December 1991, the General Assembly adopted an unprecedented resolution on transparency in armaments by an overwhelming vote. On the basis of that resolution 46/36 L - the Register of Conventional Arms was established as from 1 January 1992. Member States are requested to report, by 30 April 1993, pertinent transfers relating to the calender year 1992.

In order to help Member States in making their returns, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to set up a panel of governmental technical experts on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to elaborate the technical procedures and to make any adjustments to the annex to resolution 46/36 L necessary for the effective operation of the Register. In addition, the Secretary-General was asked to prepare a report on the modalities for early expansion of the Register by the addition of further categories of equipment and the inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through national production.

The report of the Panel (A/47/342 and Corr.1), which, as the Committee will recall, I introduced in detail at the 7th meeting of the Committee, on 16 October last, is a consensus report. In his report "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" (A/C.1/47/7), the Secretary-General commended the results of the Panel's work. He urged Member States:

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

"to embrace their recommendations so that we may give the Register a strong foundation and the broadest possible participation by States". (A/C.1/47/7, para. 35)

It is therefore with great pleasure that I have the honour today to introduce the draft resolution concerning transparency in armaments - document A/C.1/47/L.18 - on behalf of the following sponsors: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, the Central African Republic, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Singapore, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Venezuela. I have also just been informed by the representative of Nepal that his country will also join the list of sponsors.

The purpose of the draft resolution is to maintain momentum towards the overall political objectives set by the General Assembly. According to the draft resolution, the General Assembly would endorse the Panel's recommendations on the technical procedures and adjustments to the annex necessary for the effective operation of the Register.

As to follow-up activities to be undertaken for the further development of the Register, the General Assembly would note the suggestions offered in the Panel's report as a first step in the consideration of modalities for early expansion of the Register. The draft resolution keeps intact all that we decided last year: encouragement is given to follow the route set out,

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

using the road-map contained in resolution 46/36 L. In the meantime, Member States are called upon to provide the requested data and information to the Secretary-General annually by the due date. Since the Register of Conventional Arms constitutes a dynamic project, Member States are also encouraged to inform the Secretary-General of their national arms import and export policies, legislation and administrative procedures, both as regards authorization of arms transfers and prevention of illicit transfers, in conformity with paragraph 18 of resolution 46/36 L. The last of these points, regarding prevention of illicit transfers, is also in the spirit of resolution 46/36 H.

In the text of this year's draft resolution, stress is placed on the importance of the participation of all States in the Register, and of the need for sufficient resources to be made available for the United Nations Secretariat to operate and maintain the Register. As the Secretary-General noted in his report "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era":

> "Nothing would undermine the Register's operations more quickly than inadequate attention to the funding which is necessary to make it an effective instrument." (A/C.1/47/7, para. 36)

Especially in view of the new and additional tasks of the Office for Disarmament Affairs relating to data and information management and in view of the increased scope of the interactions of the Office with national and international organizations, the need to which the Secretary-General referred cannot be emphasized enough. Of course, we trust that in providing sufficient resources to operate and maintain the Register, the Secretary-General will, to the maximum extent, utilize currently available resources of the Secretariat.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

Transparency in armaments encompasses more than the Register per se. It is for this reason that in the draft resolution the General Assembly would also encourage the Conference on Disarmament to continue its work undertaken in response to the requests in paragraphs 12 to 15 of resolution 46/36 L.

The provision of the data and information I referred to a moment ago will enable the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its next session a progress report on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development. In the execution of that task the Secretary-General will also have at his disposal the report of the Conference on Disarmament under its agenda item entitled "Transparency in armaments".

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

If all this is carried out as foreseen, the prospects will be good that the group of governmental experts in 1994 will find a sound basis when they commence their work on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development.

During the consultations on the text of the draft resolution that I have just introduced I felt very encouraged by the broad support expressed for the aims and objectives of the transparency endeavour. It is therefore the hope of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18 that it will be adopted without a vote.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom): There is an increasing awareness of the importance of transparency in armaments. The dangers of excessive and destabilizing accumulations of arms have been demonstrated by conflicts in Europe, the Middle East and Africa and elsewhere. The European Community and its member States strongly believe that transparency, coupled with restraint and responsible policies in arms transfers, increases confidence, and therefore stability, worldwide.

It was with this goal in mind that the Community and its member States strongly supported in the First Committee last year the draft resolution that established the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. Resolution 46/36 L was adopted by an overwhelming vote at last year's session of the General Assembly. The full implementation of the Register, together with participation by all United Nations Member States, will be a vital step towards transparency and confidence-building in the field of conventional arms. The Community and its member States reiterate their commitment to supply all the data and information necessary for the effective operation of the Register, and they call upon all other States also to comply fully with its requirements.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

A further positive step has been the report by the Secretary-General's panel of governmental experts established by last year's resolution to elaborate technical procedures for the effective operation of the Register and to report on the modalities for its future expansion. The Chairman of the expert panel has introduced the report. The Community and its member States fully support the excellent work of the panel and endorse its recommendations.

We note that adjustments to the annex recommended by the panel reflect regional concerns. All States will now be able to provide, in a uniform manner, data on arms imports and exports required by resolution 46/36 L. We call upon all States Members of the United Nations to provide the requested data and information to the Secretary-General annually by the due date. The provision of such data will help to identify irresponsible and destabilizing arms transfers.

The Community and its member States welcome the fact that the Conference on Disarmament has inscribed the issue of transparency in armaments on its agenda and has begun to respond to the General Assembly's requests contained in resolution 46/36 L. We expect that the Conference on Disarmament will play a substantial role in this field - in particular, by elaborating practical means of increasing transparency in armaments, including transparency with regard to weapons of mass destruction.

The Community and its member States fully support and will co-sponsor this year's draft resolution, which recognises and endorses the panel's work. We shall cooperate closely with all interested member States in bringing an agreed text to the General Assembly. We stress the importance of having all

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

States participate in the Register and the need for sufficient resources to be made available, so far as possible from within existing resources, for the Secretariat to operate and maintain the Register.

Support for the draft resolution endorsing the report of the Secretary-General's expert panel will be an essential step on the road to the effective operation of the United Nations arms Register. This will be a major contribution to confidence-building and to the security of States in all regions of the world.

I should like at this point to address another agenda item, again on behalf of the European Community and its member States.

Under agenda item 55 the First Committee deals with the issue of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. The European Community and its member States note that in resolutions since 1974 Egypt has called for the establishment of such a zone. Such resolutions have been adopted by consensus in the General Assembly for more than 10 years.

In 1990 President Mubarak of Egypt suggested expanding the scope of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. He proposed that the Middle East should be declared a region free of all weapons of mass destruction, because the threats to the region had continued to grow as a result of the accumulation of arms in the region. This proposal was well received by the international community. In this context, the European Community and its member States welcome the Israeli Prime Minister's statement in the General Assembly on 1 October that Israel is ready to pursue the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

The Community and its member States believe that the early establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East would constitute an effective measure of non-proliferation and arms control. To be real and effective, such a zone would have to be freely negotiated and agreed to by all parties in the region.

The Gulf crisis demonstrated the extent to which the excessive accumulation of arms, as well as the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and missiles capable of delivering those weapons, could endanger peace and security. Security Council resolution 687 (1991) recalled the objective of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East region. It also pointed to the threat that all weapons of mass destruction pose to peace and security in the area, as well as to the need to work towards the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of such weapons.

The Community and its member States believe that a successful outcome to the Middle East peace process launched in Madrid in October 1991 will pave the way for the establishment of a Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction. We reiterate our support for the peace process and, in this context, will continue to contribute fully to the multilateral Working Group on Arms Control and Regional Security.

The Community and its member States believe that the most effective way to create a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East would be for all States to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) and to comply fully with all its obligations. However, we recognise that there are other important confidence-building measures short of this objective. One is for

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

all States in the region to put all their nuclear material under full-scope safeguards arrangements, possibly on a regional basis. We are grateful, in this context, for the work done by the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to devise model safeguards agreements, and we encourage him to continue his efforts.

The validity and normative value of the Convention on biological and toxin weapons was reaffirmed in the Final Declaration adopted on 27 September 1991 at the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention. The Declaration clearly stated the determination of States parties to exclude completely the possibility of bacteriological or biological agents and toxins as weapons. States Parties also expressed their belief that universal adherence to the Convention would enhance international peace and security.*

---

* Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

The Community and its member States would like to take this opportunity to call on all States in the Middle East region to become parties to the Convention on biological and toxin weapons. As a biological weapons capability was clearly a possibility in the Middle East, as suggested by the recent events in the Gulf, it appears to us that all States in the region should have a particularly keen interest in full adherence to the Convention.

The Third Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention decided to establish an ad hoc group of governmental experts to identify and examine potential verification measures from a scientific and technical standpoint. The Community and its member States welcome the work carried out at the first meeting of the expert group and look forward to the successful completion of its efforts in 1993.

The Community and its member States welcome the successful conclusion of the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva on a convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction. We believe that the convention will make a major contribution to international security, particularly in areas of regional tension. We fervently hope that all States in the Middle East will demonstrate their commitment to the aim of a universal ban on chemical weapons, expressed in the 1989 Paris Declaration, by becoming original signatories to the convention. Universal adherence will be an important element for the convention. Adherence by all States in the Middle East, especially as this is an area where chemical weapons have been used on several occasions in the recent past, would contribute to the security of the region and of the world as a whole.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

The call to make the Middle East a zone free of weapons of mass destruction merits full support from the international community. The Community and its member States are pleased that such a call is now also reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11, in its eighth preambular paragraph. This paragraph goes even further as, through its reference to general and complete disarmament, it involves conventional weapons too.

In conclusion, the Community and its member States express the hope that the Middle East will set out on the road of arms control and disarmament.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): First, since I am speaking for the first time, I wish to join previous speakers in congratulating our Chairman on his assumption of the chairmanship of the First Committee at the forty-seventh session. The Committee is entrusted with very important tasks related to international security, arms control and disarmament matters at this historic juncture in a changing international environment. I feel sure that his long and rich experience in New York, Geneva and Cairo, as well as his well-known and highly respected competence, will facilitate our successful discharge of the tasks entrusted to us in the Committee.

The purpose of my statement today is to express Japan's wholehearted support of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18, which Ambassador Wagenmakers of the Netherlands has just introduced on behalf of its sponsors, which include Japan. Ambassador Wagenmakers enumerated 44 countries as sponsors of the draft resolution; I understand that with recent additions the total is now 47.

The draft resolution welcomes and endorses the Secretary-General's report (A/47/342 and Corr.1) on the technical procedures and adjustments to the annex to last year's resolution 46/36 L necessary for the effective operation of the

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and on the modalities for its early expansion. The Secretary-General's report, which was prepared with the assistance of a panel of governmental technical experts nominated by him on the basis of equitable geographical representation, was introduced to the Committee on 16 October by Ambassador Wagenmakers, who chaired the panel, and under whom I had the pleasure and honour of working as a member of the panel. Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18 not only welcomes and endorses the panel's report, but also reaffirms the resolve manifested last year in resolution 46/36 L to continue to work for an enhanced level of transparency in armaments.

Our resolve last year was indeed of signal importance. The debate in the First Committee on the establishment of the Register demonstrated the genuine interest of a vast number of member States in how to enhance security among nations in the aftermath of the cold war and the Gulf War. This was in consonance with the growing awareness that international security, arms control and disarmament matters are now more in the hands of all States Members of the United Nations rather than in the hands of super-Powers or nations in the former East or West blocs, and that the United Nations should play a greater role in the formation of a new world order.

Resolution 46/36 L, adopted last year after in-depth debates and intensive, wide-ranging consultations, represents a commonsense approach to the question. It was a modest step forward to enhanced transparency in armaments, but was a clear departure from the past in that it was action-oriented and contained a built-in mechanism for improvement, review and expansion of the transparency device it established.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

In accordance with the resolution, the panel of governmental technical experts made its best efforts to elaborate the technical procedures needed for the newly created Register of Conventional Arms and made adjustments to the annex to last year's resolution necessary for the Register's effective operation.

I have little to add to the excellent statement by the Chairman of the panel made on 16 October in introducing the panel's report. The panel had to meet in three demanding sessions earlier this year and had to work hard to strike a balance between the international cause of promoting greater transparency in military matters and the inherent right of States to individual and collective self-defence. The outcome was a consensus report which contains a manual-type guidance to Member States, in returning data and information to the Register, as to what categories of arms should be reported and how, starting from this calendar year's arms transfers, as well as available background information regarding their military holdings, procurement through national production, and relevant policies. The report should serve as a solid basis for the Register's smooth implementation, with the wide participation of Member States.

The report also contains the result of the panel's considerations on the modalities for early expansion of the Register's scope. These considerations should also serve as useful material for the Register's early expansion, the procedure for which is set out in last year's resolution.

In this connection, Japan welcomes the Secretary-General's report, "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era", in

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

which he commends the results of the panel's work and assures us that the United Nations

> "will do all that it can to make the Register an efficient and successful service for Member States." (A/C.1/47/7, para. 36)

Japan is of the view that the Office for Disarmament Affairs should be staffed adequately to operate and develop the Register and disarmament database and to be able to deal with growing disarmament tasks in today's world.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

Furthermore, Japan looks forward to the role the Conference on Disarmament can play in this field of enhanced transparancy in armaments, as requested in resolution 46/36 L. This year, the Conference on Disarmament initiated deliberations on the subject. This may be a sign that, after the successful completion of the Convention on chemical weapons, the Conference on Disarmament may come to grips with the new requirements of our times in the field of arms control and disarmament.

On the question of the United Nations Register, I would be amiss if I did not refer to the Tokyo Workshop on Transparency in Armaments, which was held from 1 to 3 June this year. This was a seminar hosted by my Government in order to contribute to the cause of enhanced transparency in armaments and to the effective implementation of the United Nations Register. In addition to 17 panel members, prominent governmental experts from 8 other non-panel Member States who showed active interest last year on the question of the United Nations Register were invited. The three-day seminar proved to be extremely useful in exploring and deepening common understanding on the nature of the United Nations Register as a global confidence-building measure. Since the Register was a departure from past practices, it was only natural that concerns and apprehensions were expressed. However, it was encouraging to note that there was a broad agreement among participants that this new path should be given a chance to be tried.

Indeed, there was an agreement that this modest step, which may turn out to be a bold step forward, should be given a chance to see whether it works in our search for a better world order, with the United Nations playing an increasingly greater role.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

For all the reasons I have just given, Japan is of the view that draft resolution A/C.1.47/L.18 deserves serious attention and wholehearted support from all Member States. Since the draft resolution is essentially technical and procedural in nature, and at the same time is meant to keep up last year's resolve and momentum, Japan believes that it should be adopted by consensus without a vote.

Mr. PARK (Republic of Korea): Since this is the first time I have spoken in the Committee, may I express my sincere congratulations to Ambassador Elaraby of Egypt on his election as Chairman of the First Committee. I have no doubt that his eminent leadership will guide us through to successful deliberations on the various issues before the First Committee.

I would like briefly to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18, entitled "Transparency in Armaments", just introduced by the representative of the Netherlands and further elaborated on by the representatives of Japan and the European Community.

In recent years, the international community has been giving greater attention to the importance of transparency and openness in relations between States for reasons obvious to all of us. It is no coincidence, therefore, that international dialogue is focusing with renewed vigour on confidence-building measures and, in particular, on ways to promote transparency and openness in military matters, including the area of arms transfers.

My delegation is encouraged to see substantive measures being implemented to this end. A global focus, as well as the corresponding efforts of the international community, contributed to the near-unanimous adoption of the landmark resolution (46/36 L), entitled "Transparency in Armaments". Clearly,

(Mr. Park, Republic of Korea)

a solid foundation for confidence-building on a global level was thereby established.

The consensus report compiled by the Panel of Governmental Technical Expérts, which has successfully agreed on technical procedures and adjustments to the annex of resolution 46/36 L, represents one more convincing reason for our optimism and has provided further impetus to our concerted efforts to enhance transparency in the military field in general.

During the general debate of this Committee, my delegation expressed its great satisfaction that the United Nations Register on Conventional Arms had been established and that the panel of governmental experts had produced its consensus report, containing a standardized reporting form. As one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18, my delegation fully endorses the consensus report of the panel and renews its commitment to participate actively in the operation of the Register.

My delegation shares the view that there are many areas in which the Register will have to be improved and refined. For example, the parameters of the Register should be clarified in more detail, a task for which the list of arms in the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) can serve as a useful example. The expansion of the scope of the Register to include military holdings and procurement through national production will have to be further addressed in the future, both at the 1993 Conference on Disarmament and in the governmental expert group to be established in 1994.

Although there are many questions still to be answered with regard to the Register, my delegation believes that this is the time to put into action what we have already agreed to thus far. Shortcomings can be addressed as we implement the agreement.

(Mr. Park, Republic of Korea)

As the Chairman of the Panel of Governmental Experts stated in his statement on 16 October, the responsibility now lies with Member States. We must now set aside minor differences; and we must do so by recognizing the Register's potential to contribute to enhancing transparency in armaments. Providing early warning of those arms build-ups which exceed legitimate security needs and curbing destabilizing arms transfers are two of the main worthy goals to pursue.

It is with these thoughts in mind that we joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18, which we sincerely hope will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. ZAHRAN (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Following the introduction by Ambassador Wagenmakers, the representative of the Netherlands, of draft resolution A/C1/47/L.18, the delegation of Egypt would like to make some observations in that connection.

First, I shall make those observations in my capacity under the mandate given by the Conference on Disarmament in its session of 1992, as special coordinator, to chair its meetings and to conduct informal consultations on the implementation of the mandate of the Conference, emanating from General Assembly resolution 46/36 L. The report on the Conference was drawn up on the outcome of the discussions on the subject in pursuance of that mandate

This is included in the report of the Conference on Disarmament submitted to the General Assembly at its current session.

At this point I should like to express my satisfaction over the efforts made by all delegations in the course of the Conference's informal disucssions.

(Mr. Zahran, Egypt)

The various groups did not express any views or take any positions as groups. The inverventions and contributions made, were made by every delegation individually. The outcome was a number of objective and constructive views and proposals which have been reflected by the Conference's report. We note here that the report did not try to reach consensus positions on any of the views and proposals put forward because of time constraints.

Those views and proposals, which focused on the concept in paragraphs 12 and 14 of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, will be of help when the Conference on Disarmament resumes its deliberations on this subject, within the framework of an ad hoc committee, at its 1993 session, on the basis of the resolution that will be adopted on the subject by the General Assembly at the session.

It is to be noted here that the Conference was not able to make a larger achievement in 1992 because the highest priority in its deliberations was given to the conclusion of the draft Convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons which is before the current session of the General Assembly.

Several delegations expressed the view that the Conference on Disarmament should not focus solely on and accord the highest priority, next year, to the question of transparency in armaments but should accord the highest priority to achieving progress on the items relating to nuclear weapons and, at the same time, devote the necessary length of time and amount of effort to discussing the draft resolution and implementing the Conference's mandate on the subject of transparency in armaments on the basis of the draft resolution that has been submitted and resolution 46/36 L.

(Mr. Zahran, Egypt)

The Conference, at its 1993 session, will have to take into account the report of the panel of governmental technical experts contained in the report of the Secretary-General, document A/47/342.

The delegation of Egypt, on this ocasion, would like to commend the efforts of the panel of governmental technical experts on the operation of the Register in the relevant report before the current session of the General Assembly. We pay special tribute to the efforts of Ambassador Wagenmaker of the Netherlands who chaired the panel of governmental technical experts.

On this occasion, we should like to state that the delegation of Egypt has several observations to make on the procedure and substance of the study, especially with regard to the part concerning the mechanisms of expanding the scope of the Register. The delegation of Egypt would have hoped for a more profound study of the subject by the panel of governmental technical experts in line with the clear mandate given to the panel by the General Assembly in its resolution 46/36 L.

The Conference on Disarmament will also have to take into account the achievements of the previous session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) on objective information on military matters. The Conference will also make use of the document which the Conference on Disarmament has requested its Secretariat to prepare, namely, a compilation of the transparency measures that have been adopted at the bilateral, regional and multilateral levels in the area of armaments. Hence the importance of the need for all delegations to provide the Secretariat of the Conference on Disarmament at an early date with all the measures they propose in this

(Mr. Zahran, Egypt)

respect, so that the Secretariat of the Conference may be able to incorporate such information in the proposed report with a view to achieving the desired progress in the Conference's deliberations, next year.

I should like also to underscore some of the considerations already mentioned during the general debate in the First Committee and dealt with in the statement of Egypt.

First, transparency in armaments is a subject that is part of confidence-building measures. It should be achieved within the context of a favourable political climate as part of an integrated process aimed at reducing tension at the regional level.

Secondly, the importance of the application of the principle of transparency in armaments stems from the understanding that such transparency would include all the categories and classes of weapons in the possession of all States, on an equal footing and in a balanced fashion. This makes it necessary that the Register's data should cover not only conventional weapons but also all types of weapons of mass destruction, all their components and all their delivery systems. In addition, transfers of the high technology used in the manufacture of weapons should be included in the Register. The Register should also include data of the nationally produced armaments, as well as all stockpiles on the national territories of States whether those stockpiles are directly owned by the State or owned by another party under bilateral, regional or multilateral arrangements.

(Mr. Zahran, Egypt)

Thirdly, we have requested a clarification of some vague and ambiguous provisions contained in resolution 46/36 L. We regret that the draft resolution submitted to the First Committee, contained in document A/C.1/47/L.18, did not clarify the meaning of the expression "military holdings" which, in our view, also means "stockpiles". There has been disagreement on this and on the expression "procurement through national production", in the informal consultations that took place within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. We have requested a clarification of this ambiguity that would do away with the deficiency so that domestic production and procurement resulting from such production would be covered in unequivocal terms in the text submitted to the Committee.

We regret that the sponsors of the draft resolution have failed to clarify those ambiguities whereas such clarification could have enabled the Conference on Disarmament at its next session to cover more ground in pursuance of its mandate under resolution 46/36 L.

Regarding the draft resolution submitted yesterday by the representative of Mexico on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, contained in document A/C.1/47/L.37, the Egyptian delegation supports the draft resolution and joins the list of its sponsors. This support is consonant with Egypt's position which has been expressed previously in all forums, including the general debate in the Committee. In its statement to the Committee on 28 October, the Egyptian delegation made it clear that Egypt attaches great importance to the conclusion, at the earliest possible time, of a convention on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban treaty. The Egyptian delegation expressed its regret at the

(Mr. Zahran, Egypt)

failure of all efforts made thus far in the 1992 session of the Conference on Disarmament to re-establish a special commission on a nuclear-test ban despite the improvement in the international climate and the flexibility shown by the Group of 21 in the Conference regarding the negotiating mandate of the special commission.

Our position is rooted in our firm belief that a comprehensive nuclear-test ban is a vital and crucial step on the road to halting the vertical nuclear arms race and a step that would have significant implications for the preparations for the forthcoming NPT conference scheduled for 1995 - indeed, for the future of the NPT itself. The preparations for convening the Conference and for the holding of the first session of the preparatory committee in 1993 are the subject of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.6. We, together with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37, welcome the nuclear-test moratorium by France, the Russian Federation and the United States. We reaffirm the extreme importance of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban which, in our view, is a step in the right direction toward the conclusion of a complete and comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty that would be complied with by all States under any circumstances.

The conclusion of such a treaty will be a crucial step towards halting the improvement and development of nuclear weapons and towards the halting of the vertical and horizontal proliferation of such weapons. Such a step will pave the way toward nuclear disarmament.

Included within this framework, is the vital role assigned to the Conference on Disarmament in achieving progress in negotiations on the provisions of a comprehensive test-ban treaty and the importance of

(Mr. Zahran, Egypt)

cooperation by all members of the Conference in re-establishing the ad hoc committee on a nuclear-test ban, with an appropriate mandate, for the year 1993.

This will make it possible to resume the Conference's deliberations which started in 1990 in line with operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37.

The delegation of Egypt hopes that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. FUJITA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation expresses its warm support for draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18 on transparency in armaments, which was introduced this morning by the representative of the Netherlands and which we joined in sponsoring.

Last year's General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, concerning the establishment of the United Nations Register on Conventional Arms, represented an important step in our common efforts to strengthen transparency and confidence-building in the field of transfers of conventional weapons. We are convinced that the work of the Panel of Governmental Technical Experts set up on the basis of that resolution provides valuable momentum towards attainment of those goals.

Brazil had the opportunity to participate in the work of the Panel, in which extensive, frank and fruitful discussions took place. In our view, the report submitted by the Panel is both constructive and useful and contains some seminal elements for future improvements in the functioning of the Register. It is important now that Member States should contribute to its successful consolidation by providing the Register with appropriate data and information.

(Mr. Fujita, Brazil)

As has been stated by my delegation on many occasions, transparency is not an end in itself but a step towards the adoption of effective measures in arms limitation and disarmament. As the Secretary-General indicated in his report on the occasion of Disarmament Week, "New dimensions of arms regulation in the post-cold war era":

> "... transparency is no substitute for reduction in arms but, when properly applied, it can be conducive to confidence-building among States and helpful in alerting the global community to excessive accumulations of armaments." (A/C.1/47/7, para. 34)

In this regard, while welcoming the commencement of the operation of the Register by next year, we note with concern the continuing transfers of sophisticated weapons systems internationally. As pointed out by the Secretary-General in the same report:

> "Production overcapacities and surplus equipment in industrialized States are now increasingly feeding arms markets in parts of the developing world." (ibid., para. 30)

We urge Member States to exercise due restraint in the transfers of armaments, particularly in situations of tension or conflict, as they are called upon to do in resolution 46/36 L.

Finally, my delegation would like to stress that in the new international environment, in which we are given the opportunity to build a new agenda for peace and a new agenda for development, the activities of the United Nations in the fields of disarmament and development should be promoted in a coordinated and mutually reinforcing manner and not at the expense of one another. In this respect it is the understanding of my delegation that the allocation of resources for the operation of the Register will come both from

(Mr. Fujita, Brazil)

extra-budgetary and from existing resources, but as far as the latter - existing resources - are concerned, it shall not prejudice existing priorities. On this understanding, my delegation expresses its hope that draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18 will be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to remind members of the Committee that, in accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, Friday, 6 November, at 6 p.m. is the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions under agenda items 67 and 69, relating to international security. I urge members wishing to submit draft resolutions under those agenda items kindly to do so as soon as possible.

I call upon Mr. Kheradi, Secretary of the Committee, to make a number of announcements.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the First Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following States have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.8: France;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15: Canada, France, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Portugal;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18: Samoa;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.20: Brazil and the Netherlands;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17: Viet Nam;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24: the Niger and Ukraine;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25: Paraguay and Senegal;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.34: the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Costa Rica and Myanmar;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.36: Costa Rica, Samoa and Ireland;

(Mr. Kheradi)

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37: Viet Nam;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.38: the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Malaysia; and

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42: the Netherlands, Samoa and Iceland.

The meeting rose at 11.35 a.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
26th meeting
held on
Thursday, 5 November 1992
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 26th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.26
4 December 1992

ENGLISH

92-61762 2619V (E)

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 to 65; 68 and 142; and 67 and 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Russian Federation, Mr. Batsanov, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.10.

Mr. BATSANOV (Russian Federation) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to take this opportunity to express our satisfaction at the election of Mr. Elaraby of Egypt as Chairman of the First Committee and at his success in conducting the work of the Committee.

I am glad to present, on behalf of the delegations of Belgium, Canada and Sweden, as well as the delegation of the Russian Federation, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.10 entitled "Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons".

This year at the Conference on Disarmament the delegation of the Russian Federation had the honour of chairing the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons. As representatives are aware, it was a special year for the Conference on Disarmament. Major efforts were concentrated on the development of the Convention on chemical weapons. Accordingly, as is noted in the report of the Conference to the United Nations General Assembly, negotiations in the Conference concentrated on the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, while the workload of other subsidiary bodies was lighter than in previous years.

This comment about workload applies to the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons. Nevertheless, some positive work was done

(Mr. Batsanov, Russian Federation)

within the framework of that Committee, and this has helped to clarify outstanding issues with regard both to the development of the draft convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons and to the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities. The work in these two areas was directed by Mr. Dimitrijevic of Yugoslavia and Mr. Ausman of Canada respectively, to both of whom I should like to express profound appreciation for their contribution to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee this year.

At the same time I consider it necessary to note that, when summing up the results of the Ad Hoc Committee's work this summer, a number of delegations raised the question of the need for new approaches to the solution of basic problems involved in our negotiations - problems that had emerged many years ago. As a result, the recommendation concerning the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons at the beginning of the 1993 session of the Conference on Disarmament stressed the need for the Ad Hoc Committee to be given guidance on reviewing the organization of its work with the aim of fulfilling its mandate.

The draft resolution that we are submitting today, like earlier ones, is quite simple. It reflects the work that was carried out during the year, and it takes note of the new elements in the recommendation concerning the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee, which I have just mentioned.

On behalf of all of the sponsors of the draft resolution, I express the hope that the First Committee and, subsequently, the General Assembly will find it possible to adopt the text by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Qatar, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9.

Mr. AL-NASSER (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9 on behalf of the following delegations: Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritania, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen. The draft resolution deals with agenda item 64, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament".

The draft resolution before the Committee today is based on previous resolutions adopted on this subject, the latest of which was last year's General Assembly resolution 46/39, in which the General Assembly called for placing all nuclear facilities in the region under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, pending the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

The preamble also notes with grave concern Israel's persistent refusal to commit itself not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons, thus threatening international peace and security.

In its operative part the draft resolution deplores Israel's refusal to renounce possession of nuclear weapons; urges it to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty, promptly to apply Security Council resolution 487 (1981) and to place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. It further calls upon all States and organizations not to cooperate with or give assistance to Israel in any way that could enhance its nuclear-weapons capability. It requests the IAEA to inform the Secretary-General of any steps

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

Israel may take to place its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards, and requests the Secretary-General to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session.

Allow me to say that the Council of Ministers of the League of Arab States when last they met in September of this year in Cairo, called upon the arms-exporting countries and countries parties to the NPT to do everything possible to make all the States of the Middle East place their nuclear facilities under the control of the IAEA. The Council of Ministers of the League of Arab States also called for turning the Middle East into a nuclear-weapon-free zone, a zone free from all weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical and biological alike, taking into consideration the Arab countries welcoming attitude toward all efforts that ensure security through equitable and legally binding obligations in the area of disarmament providing that such obligations are applied even-handedly according to a single standard, to all the States of the region, including Israel which has refused, to this date, to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty or to take any steps to that end.

In conclusion, we call upon all Member States to support the sponsors by voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9 and thus display their sense of responsibility and enhance the Organization's credibility without any discrimination or selectivity by insisting on Israel's compliance with United Nations resolutions and the norms of international law. By so doing, the

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

Member States will further the cause of international peace and security, while at the same time serving the cause of development, stability and peace in our region.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Colombia who will introduce draft decision A/C.1/47/L.3.

Miss CABALLERO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): Last year the First Committee adopted without a vote the draft resolution that became General Assembly resolution 46/36 H, entitled "International arms transfers". Today, on behalf of the delegations of Colombia and Peru, we are introducing draft decision A/C.1/47/L.3, entitled "International arms transfers".

The Colombian delegation regards the strengthening of international collective security as a priority, especially in the light of the challenges posed by the changing geopolitical and geoeconomic scene. If this collective security we strive for so much is not based on the widest participation and approval of the concert of nations, it will simply be the instrument of a selective and partial regime dictated by the interests of a few, leaving aside the needs of the many.

The successful development of programme or initiatives in the field of disarmament requires globalization and democratization of the decision-making and negotiating processes, as well as of the instruments we design. No multilateral treaty for disarmament or reduction of armaments agreed upon to date has come fully into force. Is it not time to ask ourselves why that is so and what we must do to attain this final goal?

(Miss Caballero, Colombia)

We believe that the will to make headway in the field of disarmament exists so long as the concerns and needs of all the participants are taken into consideration in order to achieve true consensus. The successful finalization of the Convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons proves this. Many have already pointed out that it should become our model as we tackle other spheres - as a priority, nuclear weapons. None the less, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the Convention will be truly effective only when it is ratified by all nations. But it is an important step in the right direction: a clear instance in which the value of the globalization of the negotiating process has been proved.

Aware that participation by the largest possible number of countries in the work we undertake is indispensable, the delegations of Peru and Colombia have decided to introduce a draft decision this year on international arms transfers. We believe it is advisable to grant more time to those States which have not yet done so to reply to the invitation contained in operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of General Assembly resolution 46/36 H. Many delegations, including mine, have already replied; their replies are contained in documents A/47/183, A/47/314 and A/47/314/Add.1. Therefore, we consider it indispensable that the item "International arms transfers" be included in the provisional agenda of the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

(Miss Caballero, Colombia)

The official policies on arms procurement and arms transfer complement the progress achieved so far in the promotion of transparency. Similarly, the control of arms transfers will make a definite contribution to deterrence of the proliferation of conventional weapons, a phenomenon which, in its turn, is fed by the vast illicit traffic in weapons. We will not be able to lay the foundations for lasting peace so long as we do not search for a solution to these scourges. For this reason, my delegation calls upon all Member States to support this draft decision.

We emphasize the need to achieve a global perspective and to strengthen multilateral approaches, which are indispensable for our work. The Disarmament Commission, as a forum open to all States, must tackle the fundamental problems in the field of disarmament: arms transfers and the question of proliferation. These are matters which can benefit only from open dialogue between countries. They are matters that can make headway only when we can count on the support and will of all nations. The Disarmament Commission is a vital body, the only one that offers us an opportunity to become familiar with the concerns and interests of all nations. Without these elements of judgement it is difficult for us to make any progress towards our stated - even if Utopian - ultimate goal: general and complete disarmament.

We believe that we must strive to strengthen and revitalize the Disarmament Commission in order that it may be able to carry on substantive discussions on subjects of vital importance. We believe that the work we are carrying on is a decisive contribution to the progress made in the various disarmament bodies. My delegation supports unconditionally the inclusion of a new item in the agenda of the Disarmament Commission for 1993.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the representative of Canada, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42.

Ms. MASON (Canada): In submitting draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42, under agenda item 52, "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification", I am joined by sponsors from the following countries: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain and Sweden.

In my statement to the First Committee at its 6th meeting, on 15 October, I indicated that Canada intended to submit a draft resolution on verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification. We had originally envisaged that the resolution would have two main themes. First, the resolution would take note of the Secretary-General's report (A/47/405) of 16 September 1992 on actions taken to implement the recommendations in the 1990 Group of Experts study on verification and would reiterate the call for assistance by Member States in implementing them.

Secondly, we had hoped to go beyond this to call for a follow-on study by a United Nations group of experts that would explore new developments that had taken place since 1990, which we believe warrant exploration in relation to a useful United Nations role in verification. The mandate we proposed for this follow-on study would have focused on two topics: first, the preliminary practical lessons from recent United Nations experience in the United Nations

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

Special Commission , as well as other international developments relating to verification, for United Nations verification activities, and, secondly, how the verification of arms limitation and disarmament agreements could facilitate United Nations activities with respect to preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace-keeping and post-conflict peace-building.

Subsequent to that statement, in the course of further consultations with other delegations, it has become clear that there does not exist sufficient support within this Committee to proceed with such a study by a group of experts at this time.

Canada continues to believe that the activities of the United Nations Special Commission and of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) have very real and useful conceptual and operational lessons to teach us with regard to verification in general, verification in other arms limitation and disarmament areas and with regard to United Nations activities in this field. We do not suggest that this experience can be transferred direct to other areas or that it could serve as a model for future United Nations activities, but it can provide valuable insights of both a positive and a negative nature.

One particular advantage, as Canada sees it, of the proposed study would be wider dissemination of information about a variety of United Nations activities relating to verification, including those mandated by the Security Council. It would therefore help the broader international community to participate in a meaningful way in discussions of the direction in which the United Nations is going, and indeed should go, in the field of verification.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

It has also been suggested that the last study by a group of experts was completed only two years ago and that it is therefore premature to do another. In response to this, we can only point to the astounding changes that have taken place in the international system since 1990. We all know that these changes have meant a remarkable renewed interest in the importance of the United Nations in the field of security. Heightened peacekeeping demands are but one example. The Secretary General's report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277) is a valuable attempt to come to grips with these changes and to suggest a way forward for the United Nations. We had hoped that in a much smaller way, the proposed follow-on study by a group of experts could have contributed positively to this dialogue.

As I indicated earlier, Canada has decided not to press ahead at this time with its proposal for a follow-on study by a group of experts on verification. We will, nevertheless, proceed with submission of a draft resolution on the subject, which I would like to explain briefly.

The preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42, on verification, which is being submitted today, draw heavily on earlier consensus resolutions on the subject. New elements include language relating to the impact of recent developments in international relations on verification. In addition to noting that these developments have underscored the importance of verification, the draft also indicates that some of these developments have significant effects on the role of the United Nations in this field.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

In other new preambular paragraphs the General Assembly would take note of two of these recent international developments; the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace" and the Final Declaration of the Third Review Conference of the biological and toxin weapons Convention. In the final preambular paragraph the General Assembly would recall some of the operative paragraphs of resolution 45/65, the last resolution on verification, which was adopted by consensus in 1990.

At this point I would like to explain that we have had a suggestion for an additional preambular paragraph which would follow the eighth preambular paragraph. My delegation and some others support the suggestion, and we are in the process of contacting all of the sponsors to get their views. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read out the text of the proposed suggestion, which would come after the eighth preambular paragraph:

> "Welcoming the conclusion of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, which contains an unprecedented regime of verification".

In the first two operative paragraphs of the draft resolution the General Assembly would take note of the report of the Secretary General (A/47/405) of 16 September 1992, which was prepared pursuant to resolution 45/65 and which echoes the call contained in that earlier resolution for Member States to give active consideration to the recommendations in the 1990 study of the Group of Experts and to assist the Secretary-General in their implementation.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

In operative paragraph 3 the Secretary-General would suggest - as a follow-up to the 1990 study and in view of significant developments in international relations since that study - seeking the views of Member States concerning three matters: first, additional actions that might be taken to implement the recommendations contained in the 1990 study; secondly, how the verification of arms limitation and disarmament agreements could facilitate United Nations activities with respect to preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace-keeping and post-conflict peace-building; and thirdly, additional actions with respect to the role of the United Nations in the field of verification, including further studies by the United Nations on this subject.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

In operative paragraph 4 the Secretary-General would be asked to report on this subject to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session. In the final operative paragraph the General Assembly would decide to include the subject in the agenda of its forty-eighth session.

Canada continues to believe that verification remains as relevant today as it was at any time in the past. Significant developments have taken place in the international system since the completion of the 1990 study on verification, developments that provide important opportunities for the further consideration of a useful United Nations role in verification.

We believe that this new draft resolution is a fair compromise of the various views on how to proceed on this subject. If adopted, the measures it contains will provide a useful step forward in the consideration by the United Nations of verification in all its aspects.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Sweden to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21 concerning the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, often referred to as the United Nations conventional weapons Convention.

A resolution regarding that Convention has been approved without a vote a number of times since the Convention was opened for signature in April 1981, with the Secretary-General of the United Nations designated as its depositary. Three Protocols are annexed to the Convention, namely the Protocol on Non-Detectable Fragments (Protocol I), another on Prohibitions or Restrictions

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II) and a third Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Incendiary Weapons (Protocol III). The Convention with its three annexed Protocols is an essential international agreement designed to place constraints upon the conduct of war. It is part of a tradition of international humanitarian law in armed conflicts, which in its modern form is expressed in article 35 of Protocol I additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949. The relevant paragraph of that article states:

> "It is prohibited to employ weapons, projectiles and material and methods of warfare of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering."

The 1980 Convention represents an important development of the body of international humanitarian law in armed conflicts through restricting the use of certain conventional weapons. As is stated in a preambular paragraph to the Convention, the positive results achieved in this area may also facilitate disarmament work with a view to putting an end to the production, stockpiling and proliferation of such weapons.

The 1980 conventional weapons Convention entered into force in December 1983 after the ratification of the Convention by 20 States. The number of States bound by the Convention has since then increased, but is, according to the report of the Secretary-General on the status of multilateral disarmament agreements of 12 October 1992 - document A/47/470 and Add.1 - even today not more than 33. Thus, in the draft resolution the General Assembly would note the need for wider ratification of the Convention and the three annexed Protocols and would urge States that have not yet acceded to the Convention and its three Protocols to exert their best endeavours to become

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

parties as early as possible, with a view ultimately to universal adherence. The Assembly would also note the potential of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) to consider questions pursuant to the Convention.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, India, Ireland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Russian Federation, Viet Nam and my own country, Sweden.

On behalf of the sponsors I would like to express the hope that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.21 will be adopted without a vote.

Speaking on behalf of my own delegation, I should like to add the following comments.

On 2 December 1993, 10 years will have elapsed since the entry into force of the Convention. According to article 8, paragraph 3 (a), any State party may after that period request the depositary to convene a conference to review the scope and operation of the Convention and its Protocols. Such a Conference may also agree upon amendments to the Convention and its Protocols and may consider the need for additional Protocols relating to other categories of conventional weapons not covered by the existing Protocols. A conference of this kind may also be held before 10 years have elapsed after the entry into force of the Convention if a majority of the States Parties so agree. In the view of Sweden it would now be timely to consult interested delegations on the appropriateness of such a conference to be held in the near future.

In the opinion of my country, incendiary weapons should be made subject to further specific restrictions. It is also our view that naval mines should be the object of restrictions within the framework of the Convention. A draft

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Naval Mines was submitted by my delegation last year and circulated in document A/C.1/46/15. The draft Protocol is elaborated on the basis of the concepts of neutralizing mechanisms and information, concepts already incorporated in the Eighth Hague Convention on Automatic Submarine Contact Mines and in Protocol II, attached to the United Nations conventional weapons Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices.

In addition, developments in laser technology should be followed closely. As my delegation stated earlier in this forum, there is a clear risk of the development of lasers for anti-personnel purposes on the conventional battlefield. It is technically possible to develop and manufacture specific laser weapons, the main effect of which would be to blind the adversary's soldiers permanently. Such anti-eye laser weapons may yield certain military advantages but on balance, taking into account humanitarian considerations, it seems that such lasers should be subject to prohibitions or to restrictions on their use either in a new protocol annexed to the United Nations Convention or by some other means. Swedish experts have continuously consulted with other experts in the field during the last few years and have participated in several expert meetings, many of them organized by the International Committee of the Red Cross. As a result, the ICRC has published a number of reports on battlefield laser weapons, the latest in April 1991. The reports of the meetings of experts will, according to the statement made last week by the representative of the ICRC during the general debate, be published in one volume at the beginning of 1993.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

Two Swedish experts, together with a United States professor of biomedical engineering, have also published a scientific article entitled "Blinding laser weapons and international humanitarian law". Copies of that article are available in this conference room.

Sweden attaches great importance to the further development of international humanitarian law in armed conflicts. The United Nations has declared the 1990s to be the United Nations Decade of International Law. It would be appropriate to fill this Decade with concrete action and agreements also within the field of humanitarian law in the spirit of the Hague Conventions on the laws of warfare of 1907. A well-prepared review conference of the 1980 United Nations conventional weapons Convention could serve as a means to enhance progress in this field. My delegation would be willing to consult with any other interested delegation on this matter.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): My colleague from Sweden has just introduced draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21, concerning the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to be Excessivelv Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.

The Convention merits our particular attention, now even more than it did in the past.

Many States today are deeply involved in operations which bring them into daily contact with the suffering of civilians. It is civilians who suffer most from conflicts in which weapons described in the Convention are used. This can be witnessed daily in Cambodia, Somalia and the former Yugoslavia.

The word "indiscriminate" in the title of the Convention applies to the peasant who activates a trip wire on his land or to the child who picks up a toy which explodes.

The so-called CUSHIE weapons not only cause excessive injuries or have indiscriminate effects on human beings: they also cause the elimination of biological diversity and the degradation of the environment.

The Convention applies to present-day reality, not to an academic notion or a theory.

For years the Netherlands has appealed to States to adhere to the Convention. It has a particular advantage in so far as it induces States to reflect on the military effectiveness of certain weapons and to offset this effectiveness against humanitarian considerations. These weapons used in an internal conflict become weapons of terror for civilians. It is therefore with a sense of urgency that my delegation again appeals to States to adhere to the Convention. Universal adherence would compel States not to use such weapons any more in a military conflict and it would at the same time make it

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

more difficult for such weapons to be used in internal conflicts against civilians. The prohibition of certain types of weapons will make their requisition more difficult.

Last but not least, universal adherence to the Convention will strengthen its international authority and thus highlight its obvious benefits for mankind. In this context, I wish to draw attention to the impetus which a review conference could give to furthering the objectives of the Convention. As representatives are aware, a review conference can be convened 10 years after the entry into force of the Convention, which means that such a conference could be held in 1993. By inviting as many States as possible to attend the conference, either as a State party or in the capacity of observer, we could promote international recognition of the value of the Convention as a vital tool of the humanitarian laws of war. Furthermore, a review of the present operation of the Convention may help clarify the scope for, and the desirability of, its further development. The Netherlands would be willing to engage in the necessary consultations leading to the holding of a review conference in 1993.

In the meantime, the Netherlands believes that the text of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21 will commend itself to the Committee for adoption by consensus, as a first step towards appropriate stengthening of the Convention.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland): As one of its sponsors, Ireland supports the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.21, on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. This draft resolution has just been introduced by the representative of Sweden.

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

The Convention on Inhumane Weapons - to use the shorter title by which it is known - was signed in 1981. It represented a major development in the efforts to lay down rules of a humanitarian nature in the matter of prohibiting or restricting excessively inhumane means and methods of warfare. It is an indication of the commitment of the international community to developing international humanitarian law in the field of conventional weaponry.

The Convention did not establish any verification rules, though my delegation and others suggested, during the negotiations leading to the conclusion of the Convention, the establishment of a consultative committee of experts to investigate alleged violations of the Protocols to the Convention. My delegation continues to believe that such a consultative committee would help increase the trust and confidence of States in the implementation of the Convention and would thus help strengthen it and promote universal adherence to it.

The representative of Sweden has drawn attention to the provisions of the Convention in relation to reviewing the scope and operation of the Convention and its Protocols. A conference convened for that purpose could also consider the issue of additional protocols to include categories of weapons not covered at present. My delegation supports the suggestion made by the representative of Sweden that delegations hold consultations on this issue.

Finally, my delegation shares the concern expressed about developments in laser technology and supports the suggestion that consideration be given to imposing prohibitions or restrictions on the use of some of these weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of France, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30.

(Mr. Errera, France)

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): I wish to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30, and also to refer to agenda item 65 and draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30, on the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), is sponsored by Austria, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Egypt, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka and France.

As representatives will recall, the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session, aaopted without a vote resolution 45/62 G, which had been introduced on the occasion of UNIDIR's tenth anniversary.

(Mr. Errera, France)

After recognizing in that resolution:

> "the increased importance and high quality of the work of the Institute in the execution of its mandate under its Statute", (resolution 45/62 G, para. 2)

the General Assembly requested the Institute to prepare, with the assistance of independent experts, a research report on the economic aspects of disarmament.

That report was transmitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General in document A/47/346. The study was carried out with the assistance of non-governmental experts of international standing from the following countries: Egypt, France, India, Mexico, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, Sweden, United Kingdom and United States, with the participation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The experts adopted their report by consensus.

The growing importance of the subject covered by the UNIDIR research report is acknowledged by the international community, the general debate in this Committee has shown. We feel that UNIDIR's conclusions merit study by the Governments of Member States.

That is why draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30 welcomes the research report and commends it to the attention of Member States. It encourages them to give active consideration, in particular, to the economic principles for disarmament contained in the executive summary of the report.

The sponsors of the draft resolution hope it will be adopted without a vote.

I would now like, as I stated earlier, to turn to agenda item 65. The French delegation is happy to support the Swedish delegation, which introduced

(Mr. Errera, France)

draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21 on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventioal Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. France is a sponsor of the draft resolution.

France is happy to note that a growing number of States have acceded to the 1980 Convention, although the number of States Parties is still too small. The most recent armed conflicts have proved, if proof were needed that humanitarian law must be rigorously applied and strengthened. Civilian populations are generally the first victims of the use of certain weapons, including anti-personnel mines. To respond to this grave problem, raised here by the representative of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), France hopes for a renewal of the process aiming at strict control of such weapons.

To this end, France above all supports the initiative of the Swiss Government to convene in the first three months of 1993 a conference on the application of humanitarian law, and it will request that the subject of anti-personnel mines be given priority attention.

Moreover, in accordance with article 8 of the 1980 Convention, France has decided to request that amendments be made to the Convention. It proposes a revision of Protocol II, on prohibition or restrictions on the use of mines, booby traps and other devices, and the addition to it of provisions on the verification of matters that might constitute infringements of undertakings.

France is therefore preparing to request the Secretary-General, as depositary of the 1980 Convention, to convene of an amendment conference during 1993.

(Mr. Errera, France)

To return to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.23, my delegation associates itself with the wish expressed by the representative of Sweden that it be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: As the Committee is aware, this year a total of two draft decisions and 40 draft resolutions - in other words, 42 draft proposals - have been tabled under the various disarmament agenda items. In accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, the Committee will begin taking action on those draft decisions and resolutions on Thursday, 12 November. A total of 10 meetings has been allocated for this phase of the Committee's work, which will last until 18 November.

In this connection, members will recall that at the organizational meeting of the Commitee on 8 October the Chairman stated his intention of following the useful device of clustering draft resolutions, which has evolved over the past several years. A meeting of the officers of the Committee is scheduled for this afternoon to address the matter. The Chairman will be in a position to provide the Committee early next week with a paper grouping together draft resolutions in several clusters, with a view to facilitating the Committee's task at the stage of taking action on the draft proposals.

On another matter, I should like to inform representatives that at an informal open-ended meeting of the Group of Friends of the Chairman, which was held on Tuesday, 3 November, the representative of Indonesia proposed that an official meeting of the First Committee should be devoted specifically to consideration of the report of the Secretary-General submitted under agenda item 63 (f), the report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold war era" (A/C.1/47/7). I would like to

(The Chairman)

add that the proposal received broad support at that meeting. I therefore suggest that the morning meeting on Wednesday, 11 November, be allocated to consideration of the report of the Secretary-General. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to allocate that meeting for consideration of that report.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Accordingly, I request delegations wishing to speak at the special meeting next Wednesday to enter their names for that purpose on the list of speakers.

A number of representatives have approached the Chair concerning an extension of the deadline for submission of draft resolutions under international security agenda items, items 67 and 69. The officers of the First Committee have reviewed the matter and as a result of their review I suggest that the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions under international security items be extended to Tuesday, 10 November, at 6 p.m. to enable the representatives concerned to conclude their consultations.

If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the proposed deadline is acceptable to the Committee.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.1: Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone;

A/C.1/47/L.5: Kenya and Cameroon;

A/C.1/47/L.15: Spain and Chile;

A/C.1/47/L.22: Iceland;

A/C.1/47/L.24: United Arab Emirates;

A/C.1/47/L.25: United States of America;

A/C.1/47/L.26: Indonesia;

A/C.1/47/L.29: Estonia;

A/C.1/47/L.32: Bhutan;

A/C.1/47/L.33: Bhutan;

A/C.1/47/L.35: Estonia;

A/C.1/47/L.36: Belgium;

A/C.1/47/L.40: United States of America;

A/C.1/47/L.42: India and Cameroon.

I should like also to draw the attention of representatives to the fact that we have made available to them copies of two publications prepared by the Office for Disarmament Affairs following two conferences that were organized this year: Topical Papers 9: The Asia-Pacific Region: Non-Proliferation and Other Disarmament Issues, which contains material presented at a meeting held at the United Nations Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the

(The Secretary)

Pacific in Katmandu, Nepal, from 27 to 29 January 1992; and Topical Papers 10: Non-Proliferation and Confidence-building Measures in Asia and the Pacific, which contains material presented at a conference held in Hiroshima, Japan, from 15 to 18 June 1992. Additional copies of these two publications are available in this Conference Room.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.